IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

MONDAY, THE 4TH DECEMBER 2006 / 13TH AGRAHAYANA 1928

WP(C).No. 22871 of 2006(W)

PETITIONER:

P.J. CHACKO, PULICKAL PULIMOOTTIL HOUSE,
MARANGATTUPALLY P.O., KOTTAYAM.

BY ADV. SRI.D.SREEKUMAR

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE SECRETARY, REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, KOTTAYAM.

2. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, KOTTAYAM.

3. MATHEW PAILY KUNJU,
THEKKUMTHUKATTUPIRAKIL, MEMURY P.O.,
MANJOOR, KOTTAYAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.M.A.FAYAZ.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 04/12/2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

W.P.(C).NO.22871 of 2006-W

Dated this the 4th day of December, 2006

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is having a regular permit on the route Vaikom-Kunnonni. The third respondent is operating his Stage Carriage KL-05/T 4529 on the route Kuruppanthara Market-Punalur. The time schedule of the said vehicle was settled in a timing conference held on 12-6-2006. The petitioner could not participate in that meeting. So, immediately he filed a representation on 12-6-2006 itself, to modify the time schedule of the said vehicle, taking into account his grievance. The said objection is produced as Ext.P2. Such a representation filed immediately after the settlement of timings is not maintainable. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the time schedule granted to the third respondent, his remedy is to file a revision against it. In view of the above position, the writ petition is dismissed, without prejudice to the contentions of the petitioner and his right to invoke the statutory remedy available to him.

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,JUDGE.

MS